

To: Ferrell, Mark[Ferrell.Mark@epa.gov]
Cc: Miller, Linda[miller.linda@epa.gov]
From: Levine, Carolyn
Sent: Wed 2/26/2014 7:03:25 PM
Subject: RE: Senator Rockefeller inquiry re: American Water study on residuals

Thanks Mark.

Sorry, but I still need to respond to the specific request asking whether EPA's draft report/summary/feedback will be a public document and/or something that we can provide the Senator's office. If it is internal or "draft" in any way then we do not need to discuss our internal efforts, but I do need that clarification. I am happy to ask the specific question directly to a R3 if it's easier. Let me know...thanks

Carolyn Levine

Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations

U.S. EPA

(202) 564-1859

levine.carolyn@epa.gov

From: Ferrell, Mark
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 1:37 PM
To: Levine, Carolyn
Subject: Re: Senator Rockefeller inquiry re: American Water study on residuals

I believe this is intended as part of our collaboration with BPH, DEP and the water company.

From: Levine, Carolyn
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 1:19:43 PM
To: Ferrell, Mark
Subject: Re: Senator Rockefeller inquiry re: American Water study on residuals

Thanks Mark. Is the purpose/audience of the report intended to be AW? Public audience, or internal?

Carolyn Levine
U.S. EPA
Office of Congressional Affairs
(202) 564-1859

From: Ferrell, Mark
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 12:29:03 PM
To: Levine, Carolyn
Subject: Re: Senator Rockefeller inquiry re: American Water study on residuals

During a call on 2/3/14 among chemists/scientists (EPA, state, WV American, private labs) to discuss analytical methods for PPH/diPPH, American Water offered to provide a summary of the basis for their expectation that the chemicals would not be a persistent problem in the distribution system, and requested that EPA review the summary.

Basically, initial efforts were to assure that consumer exposure would be minimized while getting rid of the contaminant material through system flushing—systematically and progressively flushing the material from the distribution system (to be followed by flushing of residence/building plumbing, according to directions provided). Their thinking was/is that, on the basis of the chemical properties of MCHM and PPH, they would not be persistent in the distribution system (i.e., they wouldn't adhere to pipes/plumbing). This last piece (the chemistry/pipe interaction) is the subject of the summary approach that WV American offered to provide to EPA for review. EPA notified American Water that we would review the summary, consistent with providing technical assistance (to both WV American as well as to the Bureau for Public Health), on February 10.

The draft summary was submitted by American Water to EPA on February 18th. We enlisted a team of researchers (from our Water Security Division and the National Homeland Security Research Center), who are very knowledgeable about distribution systems and the behavior of contaminants, to critically review the summary and provide us a report. We should have that draft report soon.

Mark

From: Levine, Carolyn
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2014 4:59:52 PM
To: Ferrell, Mark
Subject: RE: Senator Rockefeller inquiry re: American Water study on residuals

Mark,

I am not clear from your message if the region is preparing a formal document summarizing our review of WVAW summary report? I'm a little unclear why we would prepare a report of someone else's report.

Carolyn Levine

Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations

U.S. EPA

(202) 564-1859

levine.carolyn@epa.gov

From: Ferrell, Mark
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2014 4:38 PM
To: Levine, Carolyn
Subject: Re: Senator Rockefeller inquiry re: American Water study on residuals

We requested and received the briefing document from West Virginia American Water on 2/18. A formal request from the Region to other EPA reviewers went out 2/20. We asked for comments by 2/27. We hope to have a document that is releasable – without any issues of non disclosure.

This is not the same report I erroneously referenced earlier today (Guidance For Decontamination Of Water System Infrastructure prepared in 2006). We have had many requests for that report (which we are not at liberty to release) and I apologize for the confusion.

Mark

From: Levine, Carolyn
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2014 3:46:14 PM
To: Ferrell, Mark
Cc: Miller, Linda
Subject: Senator Rockefeller inquiry re: American Water study on residuals

Mark,

Your February 11 email regarding and AW study on residuals in piping (below) is what Laura in Senator Rockefeller's office is inquiring about. Is this the same as the 2006 Report referenced in your earlier email today?

She thought that you were referencing a new report, so can you please clarify this with appropriate folks?

Follow up question is- was this report requested by EPA or provided To EPA as an fyi, did EPA sign a non-disclosure (as referenced in the summary of the 2006 report). Any clarification that your folks can provide would be appreciated...thanks again!!

Carolyn Levine

Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations

U.S. EPA

(202) 564-1859

levine.carolyn@epa.gov

From: Ferrell, Mark
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2014 1:53 PM
To: Laura Chambers; Levine, Carolyn
Cc: Snyder, Raquel; Miller, Linda
Subject: Re: update on samples

Regarding the question on residuals in pipe. American Water is providing a summary of the exiting science addressing residuals in piping. We are expecting the summary by the end of the week. Once we have it, EPA will provide a review. I will keep you posted on it's progress.

From: Chambers, Laura (Rockefeller) <Laura_Chambers@rockefeller.senate.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2014 4:56:39 PM
To: Levine, Carolyn
Cc: Snyder, Raquel; Miller, Linda; Ferrell, Mark
Subject: RE: update on samples

Thanks for the update on the response to the health study. Appreciate and info others can give on the additional questions relating to reactions to pipes, the formaldehyde found at Vandalia Grille and updates on remediation efforts.

Laura

From: Levine, Carolyn [<mailto:Levine.Carolyn@epa.gov>]
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2014 4:47 PM
To: Chambers, Laura (Rockefeller)
Cc: Snyder, Raquel; Miller, Linda; Ferrell, Mark
Subject: RE: update on samples

Hi Laura,

I am adding Linda Miller and Mark Ferrell in our Region 3 office who have been working with the technical folks to respond to your questions. They can facilitate responding to your additional questions.

Regarding the Senator's letter to CDC and EPA, we have prepared a joint response with CDC which should be coming from CDC in the next day or so.

Please let us know if you have additional questions.

Carolyn Levine

Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations

U.S. EPA

(202) 564-1859

levine.carolyn@epa.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: Chambers, Laura (Rockefeller) [mailto:Laura_Chambers@rockefeller.senate.gov]

Sent: Monday, February 10, 2014 3:17 PM

To: Levine, Carolyn

Cc: Snyder, Raquel

Subject: RE: update on samples

Hi Carolyn,

I hope you had a good weekend. I wanted to follow-up on my last email on Friday afternoon and also I had some more follow-up questions we are trying to stay on top of.

- o Is there any additional info on MCHM or PPh and how it behaves with different types of pipes. Our initial questions were: Do they cling to materials like glass or metal? Do they permeate plastic/PVC? (there have been some conflicting reports on how chemicals would react to metal, glass, plastic, PVC, clay etc)
- o Any updates on remediation? (especially in light of recent weather - freeze / thaw, higher river levels)
- o Any progress on a response from EPA and CDC on the Senator's request for a long-term study?

Thanks for your help in getting us answers.

All the best,

Laura

-----Original Message-----

From: Chambers, Laura (Rockefeller)

Sent: Friday, February 07, 2014 6:02 PM

To: 'Levine, Carolyn'

Subject: RE: update on samples

Thanks for sharing. Did you mean 190 PPB?

Is formaldehyde very common in toilets or at least more common than in faucet water? If so, why? Is there a reason it would be more common in toilet water than faucet water- IE from cleaning products?

Thanks,

Laura

-----Original Message-----

From: Levine, Carolyn [<mailto:Levine.Carolyn@epa.gov>]

Sent: Friday, February 07, 2014 5:28 PM

To: Chambers, Laura (Rockefeller)

Cc: Miller, Linda; Ferrell, Mark

Subject: RE: update on samples

Hi Laura,

We have some additional information regarding Dr. Simonton. EPA contacted Dr. Simonton/Marshall University to ask questions concerning the reported formaldehyde results in some water samples. On February 5th, Dr. Simonton provided EPA with a lab report for five samples collected at one location - Vindalia Grille - on 1/13/14.

The regional lab's summary of results based on the lab report:

- Five samples (3 from water tanks from bathroom toilets) collected on 1/13/14.
- Positive formaldehyde results were 32 ppb and 33 ppb and were from the 3 toilet water samples.
- Only two of the samples with positive formaldehyde results had positive detects for MCHM (160 ppb and 1900 ppb). One sample with 32ppb of formaldehyde was non-detect for MCHM at a detection limit of 50 ppb.

- Method blanks were non-detect for formaldehyde and MCHM.

EPA will be following up with Dr. Simonton to obtain more specifics on the raw data and discuss details of methodology.

Carolyn Levine

Office of Congressional Affairs

U.S. EPA

(202) 564-1859

levine.carolyn@epa.gov

From: Levine, Carolyn

Sent: Friday, February 07, 2014 11:16 AM

To: Chambers, Laura (Rockefeller)

Subject: RE: update on samples

Hi Laura,

Our regional office did finally make contact with the scientist and received some data and information. I will find out more details and I will let you know.

Carolyn Levine

Office of Congressional Affairs

U.S. EPA

(202) 564-1859

levine.carolyn@epa.gov

From: Chambers, Laura (Rockefeller) [Laura_Chambers@rockefeller.senate.gov]

Sent: Friday, February 07, 2014 10:37 AM

To: Levine, Carolyn

Subject: RE: update on samples

Hi Carolyn,

Has anyone been able to get in touch with the Marshall scientist yet?

From: Levine, Carolyn [<mailto:Levine.Carolyn@epa.gov>]

Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2014 2:59 PM

To: Chambers, Laura (Rockefeller)

Subject: RE: update on samples

Surface water sampling includes-

Drainage on site-there are trenches upgradient and downgradient of site, sampling is in the surface water runoff into

trench.

Carolyn Levine

Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations U.S. EPA

(202) 564-1859

levine.carolyn@epa.gov<<mailto:levine.carolyn@epa.gov>>

From: Chambers, Laura (Rockefeller) [mailto:Laura_Chambers@rockefeller.senate.gov]

Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2014 2:45 PM

To: Levine, Carolyn

Subject: RE: update on samples

Are these samples coming directly from the tank or groundwater surrounding?

From: Levine, Carolyn [<mailto:Levine.Carolyn@epa.gov>]

Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2014 2:40 PM

To: Chambers, Laura (Rockefeller)

Cc: Miller, Linda

Subject: update on samples

Hi Laura,

Some additional info. from EPA R3-

The facility's remediation consultant, CEC, collected two surface water samples on January 29, 2014. EPA, WVDEP, and plaintiff representatives collected split samples. EPA's split samples were shipped to the Region 3 Lab for Trace VOC and MCHM/PPH analysis. CEC plans on re-developing monitor wells onsite to facilitate collection of groundwater samples, which should occur on Monday, February 3, 2014.

Carolyn Levine

Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations U.S. EPA

(202) 564-1859

levine.carolyn@epa.gov<mailto:levine.carolyn@epa.gov>

Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy